

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The specification is amended by the present response to address the objections thereto noted on page 2 of the Office Action.

Claims 1-27 are pending in this application. The drawings were objected to. Claims 1-5, 10-14, and 19-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. patent 6,359,707 to Tadokoro et al. (herein "Tadokoro"). Claims 6-9, 15-18, and 24-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as unpatentable over Tadokoro. Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,545,771 to Sakai et al. (herein "Sakai") in view of JP 04-270548 to Mitsuo, further in view of U.S. patent 5,185,661 to Ng.

Addressing first the objections to the drawings, those objections are traversed by the present response.

The drawings were objected to as not labeling the steps consistent with the recitation in the specification. In response to that objection, substitute figures are submitted herein to be consistent with the specification.

Further, the specification is amended by the present response to now describe Step S616 in Figure 6. No new matter is believed to be raised by that amendment.

In view of the presently submitted changes to the specification and substitute figures, the drawings are believed to be in full compliance with all requirements.

Addressing now the rejection of Claims 1-5, 10-14, and 19-23 under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as anticipated by Tadokoro, and the rejection of Claims 6-9, 15-18, and 24-27 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as unpatentable over Tadokoro, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

Applicants initially note independent Claims 1, 10, and 19 are amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, independent Claim 1 now clarifies

that the selection of one of the plurality of print colors is performed “based on the at least one communications mechanism and corresponding specific facsimile procedure used to receive the facsimile image data”. The other independent Claims 10 and 19 are amended to recite similar features. Such subject matter is fully supported by the original specification for example at page 10, line 19 et seq.

As discussed in the present specification, in the present invention received facsimiles can be printed with different colors. The selection of the different colors for printing a received facsimile is based on the communications mechanism and specific facsimile procedure used to receive facsimile image data. As discussed in a non-limiting example in the present specification, if a facsimile signal is received on a first channel of a G3 line the facsimile can be printed in a green color, if a facsimile is received on a second channel of a G3 line the facsimile can be printed in a blue color, and if the facsimile is received on a third channel of a G4 line the facsimile can be printed in a red color.¹

The features clarified in the claims are believed to clearly distinguish the claims over the applied art to Tadokoro.

Tadokoro discloses an operation in which different communication modes can result in different color printings. Tadokoro discloses that the different communication modes include a mode in reception, in which a print color of a communication log is assigned to be blue, whereas if a communicate mode is transmission, a print color of a communication log is assigned to be black.²

Such teachings in Tadokoro differ from the claims in the following aspects.

First, Tadokoro appears to merely disclose changing a printing color of a communication log, whereas in the claims it is the received facsimile image data that is printed in different colors.

¹ See specifically this non-limiting example in the present specification at page 10, line 19 to page 11, line 3.

² Tadokoro at column 6, lines 16-22.

Moreover, as clarified in the claims the selection of the color for printing the received facsimile image data is “based on the at least one communications mechanism and corresponding specific facsimile procedure used to receive the facsimile image data”, as recited in claim 1, with similar recitations in claims 10 and 19. That is, in the claims the specific communication mechanism and facsimile procedure receiving facsimile data controls the printing color. That is not the case in Tadokoro. In Tadokoro it is merely whether operation is in a communication mode or a transmission mode that determines the print color of only a communication log. In contrast to Tadokoro, in the claims a specific communication mechanism and facsimile procedure that receives facsimile image data, for example if it is received in G3, G4, and on what communication channel, control the color in which the received facsimile image data is printed in. Tadokoro fails to teach or suggest such features.

In such ways, applicants respectfully submit that each of amended independent Claims 1, 10, and 19, and the claims dependent therefrom, patentably distinguish over the teachings in Tadokoro.

Addressing now the rejection of Claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as unpatentable over Sakai in view of Mitsuo further in view of Ng, that rejection is also traversed by the present response.

The teachings in Sakai referencing the teachings in Mitsuo at column 1, lines 41-44 are cited to teach printing data in different colors for each communication type.

Applicants initially note that such teachings in Sakai citing Mitsuo are deficient with respect to the claim features similarly as in Tadokoro discussed above.

In that respect, the noted teachings in Mitsuo are directed to printing originator indicating data in different colors based on a transmitted originator indicating data. As noted

in Sakai, at a transmitting terminal originator indicating data can be added, and then at a receiving terminal that added originator indicating data can be printed in a specified color.³

Applicants note that such teachings in Sakai differ from the claims in the following aspects.

First, such teachings in Sakai are merely directed to printing originator indicating data in a specific color and are not directed to printing the received facsimile image data in a printed color. Further, such teachings in Sakai are not directed to controlling the printing color “based on the at least one communications mechanism and corresponding specific facsimile procedure used to receive the facsimile image data”, as now clarified in independent claim 1, and similarly in independent claims 10 and 19. As noted above in the claims a specific communications mechanism and facsimile procedure, for example G3 reception, G4 reception, and the channel reception, control the color in which the received facsimile image data is printed. The noted teachings in Sakai citing Mitsuo fail to teach or suggest such features.

In such ways, applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 10, 19, and the claims dependent therefrom, patentably distinguish over the combination of teachings of Sakai in view of Mitsuo and Ng.

³ Sakai at column 1, lines 39-52.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
SNS:aif

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

I:\ATTY\SNS\19's\198554\198554US-AM DUE 091704.DOC